

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the disclosure is objected to because of improper listing of the references and improper references to limitations recited in claim 1.

Claims 31-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claims 29-30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 29-30, 32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over the patent to Lee in view of the patent to Wright and further in view of the patent to Schmidl.

At the same time, the Examiner indicated that claims 17-28 are allowed.

14

In connection with the Examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 17-23, these claims have been retained as they were without changes.

In connection with the Examiner's formal objections to the specification, applicants amended claims 29 and 30 defining a transmitter for preparing a synchronization train and a receiver for receiving and evaluating a synchronization train, so as to more clearly define the corresponding structural units of the transmitter and receiver. More particularly, claims 29 and 30 have been drafted in compliance with the features defined in method claims 17 which are realized in the corresponding parts of the inventive transmitter and receiver. Since claim 17 is considered to be allowable by the Examiner, it is believed that claims 29 and 30 should also be considered as being allowable.

In connection with the Examiner's rejection of claims 31-34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, these claims have been amended in compliance with the Examiner's requirements so that claims 31 and 33 no longer make reference to another claim, and claims 32 and 34 define exclusively an apparatus or a system comprising corresponding devices. It is therefore believed that the Examiner's grounds for the rejection of claims

14

31-34 under 35 U.S.C. 112, should be considered as no longer tenable and should be withdrawn.

Claims 31 and 33 define communication systems with the use of the method defined in the allowable claim 17, and therefore it is believed that these claims are now in allowable condition.

Claims 32 and 34 include the features of claims 29 and 30 which should be considered as allowable, and therefore it is believed that claims 32 and 34 should also be considered as allowable.

It is therefore respectfully requested to allow the present application with all the claims currently on file.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be

16

carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue.

Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233

16